The possibilities for community-driven development

A decentred analysis of participation
Community-Driven Development: claims and principles

• The poor should be the main actors in development
• Control of decisions and resources should rest with community groups
• Communities should work in partnership with ‘demand-responsive’ NGOs, government agencies
• CDD can increase the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of intervention whilst making them more pro-poor and responsive to local priorities
Effectiveness of CDD?

• Some successes shown in individual case studies
• Data is very patchy
• Micro-level evaluation/impact studies are very rare
• Appropriate institutional environments are usually missing
Uchira Water User’s Association

- Formed to operate Uchira’s new system of public and private taps as a community-based non-profit-making organisation
- Formal rights to water passed from government control to UWUA
Uchira Village Water Users Association - CDD in action

• Does some of the right things:
  – Tries to get the institution right (legal constitution, balanced gender representation, accountable reporting systems)
  – Claims broad community ownership (association owned and shaped by the community)
Findings 1- local power

- Low level of community ownership-privatisation by village elite?
- Communal labour-the poorest heavily burdened
- Poor unrecognised by local management- no special provision for access
Findings 2-strategic planning

- Economic sustainability of UWUA-still supported by GTZ
- The participatory element is most costly
- Overall regional strategic planning-limited capacity
Developing a better understanding of the local

• A decentred analysis
  – Who shapes the community?
  – Who has agency in collective life?
  – How is local demand shaped?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation categories in collective activity</th>
<th>In Uchira</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Influence on institutions</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily collective &amp; reciprocal social activity</td>
<td>No participation in Formal civil activities (except enforced communal labour. Engaged in family, very localised collective action</td>
<td>Passive/unengaged in visible collective action</td>
<td>None/marginal Can passively resist</td>
<td>Poor/have-nots Family/reproductive responsibilities Ill-health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in organized social and small-scale collective activity</td>
<td>Religion- choir/social /building groups, football club, music/dance Kiwakuki members</td>
<td>Social/reciprocal</td>
<td>Some through social connections but not actively involved in decision making</td>
<td>Little time/interest in more active participation Younger people Middle-well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in village-level bodies</td>
<td>Membership of Village Council Membership of UWUA Schools boards/Political parties Water attendants Kikwakuki coordinator ‘Independent Advisors /elders’</td>
<td>Active within collective bodies Community-workers (interface between individuals &amp; institutions)</td>
<td>Actively involved in decision-making discussions Can influence rules in theory and rules in practice</td>
<td>Family connections Personal commitment to civil activity Generally middle-older population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Village Chairman Village Executive Officer UWUA Board Religious Leaders</td>
<td>Active decision-takers</td>
<td>Make final decisions Responsible for implementation</td>
<td>Wealth Family connections Social/Religious connections Personal commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who participates?

Women

No active participation

Social/leisure participation

Active participation in village level bodies

Leadership

Men

- Poor Adult
- Middle Adult
- Wealthy Adult
- Poor Youth
- Middle Youth
- Wealthy Youth
Dynamic structure/agency framework for understanding participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Local norms ‘cultural capital?’</th>
<th>Personal motivations</th>
<th>Linking social capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Middle age/elders in leadership. Young must respect elders - perceived to be changing but persists</td>
<td>A few younger people challenging older leadership as ineffectual Majority young disinterested in local politics - looking beyond the village?</td>
<td>Successful younger participants linked through business, religious &amp; kin connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wealth</strong></td>
<td>Increasing inequality in Tz - we are all poor and we share what we have</td>
<td>Middle/wealthy keen to control resources/do a public duty. Poorest unable to participate</td>
<td>Active participants well connected – competition of the big men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Past norms - women in the home but more active role in post colonial state and special seats.</td>
<td>Women often too busy making a living/caring to participate actively</td>
<td>Active women are well connected through kin religion and wealth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

- The local is not synonymous with ‘community’
- The local is not necessarily more equitable, sustainable or effective—tendency towards ‘conservative localism’
- New spaces (rules) for participation cannot easily overcome the multiple dimensions of individual participation.
- Social protection/ enforceable rights may be more use to the poor
- Forces us to reassess the model of the facilitating state.